DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 193 SO 015 816

AUTHOR Peiss, Kathy
TITLE Working Class Gender Relationships and Leisure in the United States, 1890-1920.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Berkshire Conference on the History of Women (6th, Northampton, MA, June 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employed Women; Females; *Leisure Time; Males; *Recreational Activities; *Sex Differences; Social History; Social Life; United States History; *Working Class
IDENTIFIERS Nineteenth Century History; Twentieth Century

ABSTRACT

Recent studies of the history of working-class leisure have rested on the conceptualization of leisure as both public and male. A study of the living conditions, recreational activities, and family budgets of white working-class New Yorkers between 1880 and 1920 suggests broad ways in which working women's leisure activities contributed to a definition of working class culture. For both married and single women, working-class forms of leisure held a different meaning than they did for men. Although involved in varying degrees of the network of working-class institutions, employed women did not find the same levels of social. psychological, or economic support in their recreation as did their male counterparts. While working class men had their after-work time free to spend in saloons, fraternal organizations, and political clubs, working women's after-work time was constrained by the demands of household chores. While the male breadwinner was allowed a certain share of the family income for his own personal use, the female worker was not allowed the same privilege and thus was further limited in her leisure activities. As a result of these two factors, working women's leisure activities tended to be based in the household, family, and kinship ties. (LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathy Peiss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED247193

WORKING CLASS GENDER RELATIONSHIPS AND LEISURE IN THE UNITED STATES, 1890-1920

Kathy Peiss

American Studies Department
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Catonsville, Maryland 21228

SO 015 816

Presented at the Sixth Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Smith College, 2 June 1984. Please do not cite or quote without permission of the author.

The history of working-class leisure in the United States has emerged recently as a field of inquiry, as the cultural dimensions of labor receive greater attention from historians. Case studies of saloons, fraternal orders, city parks, and workingmen's clubs explore the meaning of leisure in working-class life and its relationship to class formation, identity, and struggle. In these works, workers' leisure is seen as inextricably shaped by an industrial mode of production, a capitalist political economy, and the evolution of class relations. "Leisure" emerges as a realm differentiated from "work" with the rise of capitalist time-discipline and control, while the forms working-class recreation assumed are seen as outgrowths of laborers' experience in the industrial wage system. At the same time, recent historians perceive leisure as an arena of partial working-class autonomy, in which an alternative or oppositional working-class culture is articulated and defended; the neighborhood saloon, in this formulation, becomes a bulwark of defense from the encroachments of capitalists and reformers, and a symbol of the vitality of workers' culture. Struggles over recreational space, although not equivalent or parallel to shop floor battles or industrial strikes, are seen as a terrain of class conflict, as well as ethnic, religious and cultural expression.[1]

An unstated assumption of much of this work rests on the conceptualization of leisure as <u>public</u> and <u>male</u>--the world of extrafamilial institutions, orgarizations and places, a world inhabited and acted upon primarily by men. In the accounts of working-class leisure, women are largely absent, marginal, or subsumed in the social category of "workers." The ways in which gender

shaped and divided working-class cultural practices in the community's leisure activities have been largely unexamined. Few have asked what women were doing while men attended the saloon or lodge, and what the consequences of their activities might have been in defining workers' culture, social relations, and class struggles. Women's work experience in the labor force and household, their restricted access to financial resources, and the barriers placed on their participation in workingmen's institutional life, placed them in a different relationship to leisure than their male counterparts. A consideration of these gender-based differences should lead us to a more complex picture of workers' leisure and working-class culture.

In exploring these conceptual issues, my paper draws upon studies which examined the living conditions, recreational activities and family budgets of white working-class New Yorkers in the years from 1880 to 1920. The American urban working class at this time was a complex amalgam of different immigrant groups and their successive generations; each had distinctive national, religious and cultural customs. At the same time, many gender-based practices among the laboring masses crossed ethnic lines. The brevity of this presentation does not permit a detailed examination of the varieties of working-class experience. Rather, my intention is to look broadly at the ways in which gender shaped workers' leisure time, and to discuss the implications of women's historical experiences in this realm for the conceptualization of working-class culture.[2]

A close examination of everyday leisure in this period indicates that much of working-class social life was divided by gender. One extensive survey

of workingmen's recreation in 1913 found that married men spent about half their leisure time apart from their families, although this figure varied with ethnicity, hours of labor, and the type of work. In the households of the West Side, for example, "the husband comes home at night, has his dinner, and goes out with the 'men,' or sits at home to read his paper."[3] A detailed 1914 study of 34 families indicates more specifically the differential quality of leisure for women and men. On Sundays, men would attend baseball games, go fishing, or take outings to Rockaway beach, while their wives stayed at home or took the children on walks or to local parks. In one Irish-American family, for example, the wife's recreation involved sitting on her front steps and gossiping with neighbors, as well as taking her children to the park and free movies at the local settlement house. In contrast, her husband on Saturday nights "goes out for a shave and afterward treats his friend at one of the saloons," while on Sunday he read the newspaper and went out for a meal.[4]

Workingmen had access to a highly visible network of recreational institutions integrated into the public life of the community. Recreation in the public sphere was an arena in which male camaraderie resonated with economic aid, resource-sharing, and political activity. The saloon, which dominated the physical space of most working-class neighborhoods, purveyed a sociability that resulted in psychological and economic support for workingmen. Not only did it serve a recuperative function, but its ability to be an employment agency, money-lender, union meeting hall, communications center, and locus for social drinking made it a hub of male working-class concerns.[5] Similarly, fraternal societies, lodges and clubs supported a a range of recreational activities for workingmen which integrated companion-

ship and amusement with economic aid. Typically such voluntary organizations would sponsor balls, picnics and excursions to raise money for charitable purposes or for mutual benefit. Organized by immigrant groups, many of these reinforced ethnic ties as well. Labor organizations and political clubs also tied leisure to larger political concerns; unions, for example, commonly used the backrooms of saloons for their meetings, linking drinking, fraternizing and union business.[6]

Through leisure activities, an interlocking organizational life emerged to support class and ethnic interests; at the same time, the nature of this recreation reinforced its homosocial character. Saloons affirmed a distinctly male sociability, with lively discussions of work, politics and sports. Many bars encouraged rowdy behavior and vulgar language generally unacceptable in other areas of social life, with "disorderly songs," obscene jokes, and risque stories bantered among the patrons. Mutuality among men was affirmed by the custom of treating rounds of beer or games of billiards to one's mates. Within this homosocial world, rituals of aggression and competition, through card games, drinking and gambling, were important mechanisms for male bonding. Similar behavior could be found in other amusement places, such as pool halls, bowling alleys, and shooting galleries.[7]

In contrast to this male public realm, the leisure activities of married women were limited and constrained. While workingmen had a broad network of ethnic, class and commercial institutions available to them, their wives had few opportunities for recreation. As one investigator observed, the "men have the saloons, political clubs, trade-unions or lodges for their recreation.... while the mothers have almost no recreation, only a

dreary round of work, day after day, with occasionally a door-step gossip to vary the monotony of their lives."[8] One of the few explicit descriptions of married women's leisure reveals its ephemeral quality, orientation to home, and reliance on informal kin and friendship networks:

> Many women spend their leisure sitting on the steps of their tenement gossiping; some lean out of the windows to keep their elbows from being scraped by the stone sills; others take walks to the parks; some occasionally visit relatives or friends; and there is, once in a while, a dinner party; but on the whole, except for the men, there is little conscious recreation.[9]

The constraints on married women's leisure time were in large part shaped by the work rhythms of the home. Women's work scheduling followed the household chores of cleaning, cooking, and child care, and did not permit the clear differentiation between "work" and "leisure" experienced by most workingmen, whose work was timed to the factory clock and bosses' commands. While men took their ease at home with the after-dinner ritual of a pipe and newspaper, women's work continued. As one reporter painted the typical evening scene in an East Side home, while "the mother is attending to her household work, the father is reading a paper, or he may be watching the children at play."[10] Doing their washing, supervising children in the tenement yard, or shopping at the local marketplace, women might find a few moments to socialize with neighbors. Given the task-oriented nature of their work, women's leisure was intermittent, snatched between household chores.

The distribution of resources among family members also structured married women's access to recreation. The working-class family as a unit allocated only meagre sums for recreation in its weekly budget, and families engaged in the cheapest of amusements. Robert Chapin's survey of New Yorkers' standard of living in 1909, for example, found that low-income families severely limited their expenditures for recreation, while more prosperous families, earning as much as $17 a week, took only inexpensive excursions and cheap theater trips. As late as World War I, working-class families spent only 2.4% of their earnings on recreation.[11]

While family expenditures for recreation were limited, a substantial portion of a household's income was allocated as spending money for the breadwinner's personal use. Husbands retained the right to remove whatever spending money they desired before contributing the rest to household expenses. Workingmen spent about 10% of their weekly income on themselves, purchasing beer and liquor, tobacco, movies and theater. Husbands' contributions to the household economy were often uncertain, and constituted a delicate problem for wives as managers of the budget. Investigator Elsa Herzfeld described men's options:

> The husband brings his wages to his wife at the end of the week or fortnight. He gives her the whole amount and receives back carfare and "beer" money; or he gives her as much as "he feels like" or "as much as he has left after Saturday night."[12]

Such spending money allowed men to pursue a social life based upon access to commercial recreation in the public domain. Married women, however, received no spending money of their own; their expenditures were governed

by family needs and dictated by the household economy. Even married women's income, earned by keeping boarders or taking in laundry, was spent on the home and family, typically buying needed clothing for children or better quality food, rather than personal recreation.

These gender-based divisions contributed to the differing uses of leisure time by working-class wives and husbands. Married women's physical and economic orientation toward the household prompted them to construct the home as a locus for family recreation. Working-class wives carefully decorated their small tenement quarters, even designating one of the multi-purpose rooms the "parlor." Heavy overstuffed furniture, cheap lace curtains, pianos and carpets, often purchased in installments, crowded the more prosperous working-class homes. For some families, observed one reformer, their "only recreation is the display of their furniture."[13] The home provided a gathering place for women's network of kin and neighbors, as well as the immediate family. Kitchens were used for everyday socializing as well as religious and cultural observances, and house parties for birthdays or other occasions were common.[14]

If workingmen's network of leisure institutions constituted an alternative culture linked to working-class interests and consciousness, as recent labor historians have asserted, then married women's place in this public culture is problematic. Women attended the balls, excursions and social events sponsored by fraternal orders, but their participation in regular lodge or club meetings was infrequent and unusual. Women's relationship to the saloon was similarly limited. Rather than seat themselves in saloons and be labelled prostitutes, drinking women more commonly "rushed the growler," buying buckets of beer to be drunk at home. Working-class women gambled, but rather than engage in the male pattern of shooting pool or

betting on cards in saloons, they commonly played "policy,' a daily lottery. Wives also voiced opposition to men's drinking up their wages in saloons, rather than committing their earnings to the household, decrying in particular the practice of treating rounds. And, as has been well documented, women's desire for political or union involvement was checked by their distaste for meetings held in saloons or unsavory halls.[15]

Married women's recreation in the public sphere was most affected, not by the traditional network of male working-class institutions, but by a commercial development, the rise of the moving picture show. Movies provided the only regular form of commercial amusement for most working-class wives. Nickelodeon shows were inexpensive, and a mother could scrimp a nickel or two from the family budget to attend a matinee or evening show with her children. Movie exhibitors encouraged married women's participation by creating an atmosphere of neighborliness. One attraction of the movies, noted one observer, was that "the mothers do not have to 'dress' to attend them."[16] Moreover, movie houses doubled as local day care centers where women could safely deposit their children for the afternoon.

In the process of welcoming married women--indeed, families--to its attractions, such commercial entertainment as the movies may well have challenged the traditional network of male-centered, working-class recreation. For married women, participation in "public" leisure activities coincided with leisure's declining basis in a semi-autonomous working-class culture, and the growth of commercialized forms of recreation.

Single working-class women in this period were much more likely to engage in leisure pursuits than their mothers or married sisters, but important constraints, growing out of their status as women and workers,

placed limits on their leisure time. Typically, such women in New York City were wage-earners in light manufacturing industries, especially the garmet trades, retail stores, and domestic service. While both women and men worked long days, usually laboring from 10 to 14 hours, women's jobs were particularly characterized by nonuniform working days. Domestic service allowed little free time, while the seasonal nature of many industries, low levels of unionization, and the ineffective enforcement of protective legislation limited many women's chances for leisure.[17]

Potential leisure hours were also consumed by exhaustion from physical exertion and recuperation from on-the-job stress. As one woman observed, "we only went from bed to work, and from work to bed again."[18] Hours spent in commuting, personal upkeep and household chores placed heavy demands on working women's time after work. Many self-supporting women spent their evening hours preparing for the next day by laundering, mending and sewing clothes. Investigator Louise Odencrantz, in her study of Italian women, reported that "when the women or girls were visited at night they were more likely to be found at home busy at the washtub or ironing board than out at a dance or theater."[18] Those living at home were often expected to help with the evening meal, cleaning, or caring for children. One survey of young working women found, for example, that three-quarters of those interviewed assisted with housework after their day of wage labor, in contrast to their working brothers.[20]

In general, single women had more spending money for recreation than working-class wives, but their resources were still more limited than men's. Sexual segmentation of the labor market, the concentration of women

in semi-skilled, seasonal employment, and the demands of the family economy structured women's wage-earning so that few could achieve self-sufficiency. Most women did not earn a living wage, estimated to be $9 or $10 a week in 1910, and the wage differential between male and female workers was vast. Only about 15% of New York's women workers in 1914 lived alone, and those who did spent most of their earnings in room, board and clothing. To pay for entertainment, many self-supporting women sacrificed an essential item in their weekly budget, such as food, to eke out enough money for amusements.[21]

Financial resources were little better among the vast majority of women living with families or relatives. Most of them handed their pay envelopes unopened to their parents; according to one study, over four-fifths contributed all of their earnings to the family. In return, most daughters were given small sums of spending money, averaging 25¢ to 50¢ a week, which was often used not only for recreation, but also to pay for clothing and transportation. Their spending money was much less than that allocated to sons, many of whom simply paid board to their parents. Women could afford simple entertainments, such as a trip to the movies, but could not purchase higher-priced amusements. Many women thus relied on treats paid for by men in order to participate in a social life oriented around commercial amusements. As one observer noted, "the acceptance on the part of the girl of almost any invitation needs little explanation when one realizes that she often goes pleasureless unless she does accept 'free treats.'"[22] Such treats placed women in a vulnerable position to men, as they bartered good looks, personality, and sexuality for companionship and amusements.

Overall, however, single women's greater leisure time, access to spending money, and ability to gain men's treats, permitted them to participate in the public realm of amusements and entertainment. Detailed accounts of reformers and social investigators indicate that many young women pursued pleasure with enthusiasm, dancing until late at night, attending theatrical performances, and going on Sunday excursions.[23]

It remains unclear to what extent young women's leisure activities reinforced their working-class consciousness. Certainly they attended the round of balls and entertainments sponsored by working-class voluntary societies and held in local halls or excursion grounds, which presumably encouraged class identification. Dances sponsored by unions and political organizations not only offered fun and sociability, but provided opportunities for educating workers and fostering class solidarity. One journalist described a union picnic and dance, for example: "No girl is expected to dance with a man who does not belong to a union unless he promises to join, for a picnic is also a proselytizing occasion."[24] The connections between daily social life and class interests were often close to the surface. Halls normally used for dances and concerts, for example, would be converted into communication centers during strikes:

> The "Grand American Palace" was packed with with a strangely unaccustomed crowd. Every night "Professor" Somebody's orchestra...dispensed music from the little platform in the corner and some scores of work-worn immigrant boys and girls, at so much per head, struggled and giggled through the waltz and two-step. But now...from gaudy wall to gaudy wall were

> jammed girls with determined workaday faces. Strikers they were--a group of shirt-waist makers, whose strike in New York has been the biggest and most bitter strike of women in the history of American labor troubles.[25]

Young women's involvement in the formal network of working-class institutions remained limited and irregular, however. Some began to enter the backrooms of saloons after 1900 to have a free lunch or pass a sociable evening, but many avoided this behavior, fearing for their respectability. Nor did young working women join lodges or mutual aid societies in large numbers. While women customarily spent 5¢ to 10¢ a week on insurance, it was usually paid into a private insurance company, not a mutual aid society. While men's benefit societies were working-class institutions for financial protection and sociability, those few for women were usually organized by middle-class reformers, philanthropists and "enlightened" department store owners.[26]

When working women did organize their own leisure, it took the form of social clubs or amusement societies. As one investigator noted, young women's organizations "seem to be largely social; they belong to little societies; they tell me they belong to a "Heart and Hand Club," a social club; nothing for the study of their own wage conditions at all."[27] Sporting such outrageous names as the "Lday Flashers" and "Lady Millionaires," these clubs held meetings, sponsored balls and outings, and attended en masse the entertainments of other clubs. As their names suggest, their purpose was pleasure, not economic support and mutual aid.

Moreover, young women's participation in public leisure activities was fueled by the emergence of new commercialized amusements, not the traditional network of working-class institutions. Thousands of young women attended public dances each week in metropolitan New York around 1910, where over 500 commercial dance halls and 100 dancing academies competed for their patronage. The large amusement parks at Coney Island and Fort George drew female wage-earners to dancing pavilions and Bowery-style arcades. Vaudeville, variety houses, and moving picture shows of the early 20th century also attracted large numbers of young women. According to one recreation report in 1910, women and girls comprised one-third of the working-class audience for vaudeville and 40% of all movie-goers.[28]

These commercial ventures fostered a culture which appealed to young working women. In these years, many women imbued their leisure time with a flamboyant personal style, articulated through dress, hair styles, and cosmetics. They adopted a more relaxed sexual attitude, linking it to an emphasis on romance; "picking up" men, using "vulgar" slang, and accepting greater physical intimacy were common cultural practices among some female wage-earners. This "modern" cultural style, enacted in the realm of leisure time, resonated with a sense of personal autonomy which women could not achieve within the workplace or the family.[29] Amusement entrepreneurs offered an alternative social space for working women, promoting an appealing notion of leisure which affirmed mixed-sex companionship, romance, and heedless fun. In this context, commercial amusement places, not the class-based recreation of the lodge or saloon, increasingly became identified with single women's social life in the public realm.

For both married and single women, working-class forms of leisure held a different meaning than they did for men. Although involved to varying degrees in the network of working-class institutions, women did not find the same levels of social, psychological and economic support as members of the working class, which men found in their recreation. Leisure activities based in the household, family, and kinship ties, as well as emergent forms of commercial entertainment, played a more important role in their daily lives.

As historians of working-class culture, we cannot assume that women were simply "workers" who, like men, forged and defended distinctive forms of popular entertainment as alternatives to leisure activities imposed by the middle-classes or elites. Within that alternative working-class culture were tensions and divisions rooted in working-class gender relations, in addition to ethnic, religious and other cultural differences. At the same time, the impact of gender was not simply to dichotomize working-class culture. Private and public realms of activity were separated but not impermeable. Within public leisure, too, a struggle between new commercial amusements and traditional institutions for the loyalties of workingmen was also taking place. At times the leisure worlds of women and men may have mutually supported class interests--in periods of labor unrest, or when faced, as in 1908, with a mayor's threat to close the city's nickelodeons. Without larger issues to galvanize the community, the exclusion and marginality of women in traditional working-class leisure activities may well have weakened class consciousness and solidarity. The sexual division of leisure cuts across working-class culture, and social historians must rethink their assumptions in that light. We must devise

a conceptualization of culture that includes both women and men, and recognizes the complex articulation of relationships and consciousness rooted in differing gender-based experiences.

FOOTNOTES

[1]On leisure as a terrain of class and cultural conflict, see Roy Rosenzweig, Eight Hours For What We Will; Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Francis Couvares, "The Triumph of Commerce: Class Culture and Mass Culture in Pittsburgh," in Michael Frisch and Daniel Walkowitz, eds., Working-Class America (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983). See also John T. Cumbler, Working-Class Community in Industrial America: Work, Leisure and Struggle in Two Industrial Cities, 1880-1930 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979); Susan E. Hirsch, Roots of the American Working Class (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978). The working-class saloon is discussed in Jon M. Kingsdale, "The 'Poor Man's Club': Social Functions of the Urban Working Class Saloon," American Quarterly, 25 (October 1973), 472-489; John Alt, "Beyond Class: The Decline of Labor and Leisure," Telos, 28 (Summer, 1976), 55-80. On changing concepts of time, see E.P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism," Past and Present, 38 (1967), 56-97.

[2]A detailed discussion of working-class women's leisure, with further documentation, may be found in my forthcoming book, Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in New York City, 1880-1920 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press), from which portions of this essay are taken.

[3]Elsa Herzfeld, Family Monographs: The History of Twenty-Four Families in the Middle-West Side of New York City (New York: James Kempster, 1905), 50; George Bevans, How Workingmen Spend Their Spare Time (New York: Columbia University Press, 1913), 31.

[4]New York (State), Factory Investigating Commission, Fourth Report Transmitted to Legislature, 15 February 1915. Senate Doc. 43 (Albany: J.B. Lyon, 1915), Appendix 7, 1781-1808 (quote 1798).

[5]Kingsdale, "'Poor Man's Club'"; Alt, "Beyond Class." For contemporary data on New York, see Bevans, How Workingmen Spend Their Spare Time, 20-21; Raymond C. Spaulding, "The Saloons of the District," University Settlement Society, Report (1899).

[6]Robert C. Chapin, The Standard of Living Among Workingmen's Families in New York City (New York: Russell Sage, 1909), 211; Lillian D. Wald, The House on Henry Street (1915; rpt. New York: Dover, 1971), 275; M.M. Davis, The Exploitation of Pleasure: A Study of Commercial Recreations in New York City (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, c. 1910), 19-20.

[7]Aspects of this male culture are described in the vice investigators' reports for the Committee of Fourteen. See, e.g. Investigator's Report, Geo. Casey's, 251 East 39th St., 27 June 1917; Cornerfield Brothers, 301 Eighth Avenue, 14 May 1917; Exchange, 1652 Madison Avenue, 12 Jan. 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers, Manuscript Division, New York Public Library.

[8]Louise Bolard More, Wage-Earners' Budgets: A Study of Standards and Costs of Living in New York City (New York: Holt, 1907), 12.

[9]Factory Investigating Commission, Fourth Report, Vol. 4, 1667.

[10]Paul Abelson, "The East Side Home," University Settlement Society, Annual Report (1897), 29.

[11]Chapin, Standard of Living, 210-212; More, Wage-Earners' Budgets, 97-98; U.S. Dept. of Labor, How American Buying Habits Change (Washington, DC: G.P.O., c. 1959).

[12]Herzfeld, Family Monographs, 50; Bevans, How Workingmen Spend Their Spare Time, 75-76.

[13]Chapin, Standard of Living, 210.

[14]See, for example, Samuel Chotzinoff, A Lost Paradise (New York: Knopf, 1955), 81.

[15]On women and drinking, see Robert DeForest and Laurence Veiller, eds., The Tenement House Problem (New York: MacMillan, 1903), v.1, 397; Lillian Betts, The Leaven in a Great City (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1902), 52; gambling is discussed in DeForest & Veiller, v.2, 27. On women and saloons as union meeting places, see Alice Kessler-Harris, Out to Work (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 158-159.

[16]"The Nickelodeon," Moving Picture World, 1 (4 May 1907), 140; Lewis Palmer, "The World in Motion," Survey, 22 (1909), 356; on movie attendance, see Davis, Exploitation of Pleasure, 16.

[17]For an overview of working conditions of female-wage earners, see Leslie Woodcock Tentler, Wage-Earning Women: Industrial Work and Family Life in the United States, 1900-1930 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); and Kessler-Harris, Out to Work.

[18]Sue Ainslie Clark and Edith Wyatt, Making Both Ends Meet: The Income and Outlay of New York Working Girls (New York: MacMillan, 1911), 132, 10.

[19]Louise Odencrantz, Italian Women in Industry: A Study of Conditions in New York City (New York: Russell Sage, 1919), 235.

[20]Consumer's League of New York City, Behind the Scenes in a Restaurant (n.p.: n.p., 1916), 12; Marie Orenstein, "How the Working-Girl in New York Lives," Factory Investigating Commission, Fourth Report, vol. 4, 1698, 2653-2654.

[21]Factory Investigating Commission, Fourth Report, vol. 1, 35; vol. 4, 1081-1509, 1738, 1676.

[22]Esther Packard, A Study of Living Conditions of Self-Supporting Women in New York City (New York: Metropolitan Board of the YWCA, 1915), 1685.

[23]See, e.g., M.M. Davis, Exploitation of Pleasure; Belle Lindner Israels, "The Way of the Girl," Survey, 22 (3 July 1909), 486-497.

[24]Mary Gay Humphreys, "The New York Working-Girl," Scribner's, 20 (1896), 513.

[25]Miriam Finn Scott, "The Spirit of the Girl Strikers," Outlook, 19 February 1910, 392.

[26]"Mutual Aid Association," Factory Investigating Commission, Fourth Report, Appendix 4, 170-174; also Appendix 7, 1572.

[27]Testimony of Dorothy Lummis, New York Special Committee of the Assembly...to Investigate the Condition of Female Labor in the City of New York, Report and Testimony (Albany, NY: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford, 1896), v. I, 85. On women's social clubs, see Herbert Asbury, The Gangs of New York (1927; rpt. New York: Capricorn, 1970), 168-169; Belle Mead, "Social Pleasures of East Side Jews," MA Thesis, Columbia University, 1904, 6,

[28]Davis, Exploitation of Pleasure; Israels, "Way of the Girl."

[29]For further discussion and documentation, see Peiss, Cheap Amusements; on sexuality, see Kathy Peiss, "'Charity Girls and City Pleasures': Historical Notes on Working-Class Sexuality," in Ann Snitow, et. al., eds., Powers of Desire (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983).